

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 7, 2005. Claims 6-11 are pending in the patent application. Claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments made herein. Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully submit, at least for the reasons set forth below, that the rejections have been overcome or are improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the patentability of claims 6-11 for the following reasons.

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action states that lines 8-10 of claim 6 are not supported by the specification. Additionally, the Office Action states that the blending steps of claims 7 and 8 are also not supported by the specification as claimed. Applicants have amended claims 6-11 to clarify these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 6-11 under §112 has been overcome.

Claims 6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that the language of claim 6 is not clear. The Office Action also states that certain terms in claim 9 are vague. Applicants have amended these claims to clarify the claims and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 6 and 9-11 under §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Published Patent Application No. 7-1072942 Watanabe ("*Watanabe*"). Applicants respectfully submit that *Watanabe* does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claims 6-11 at least for the following reasons.

Watanabe is directed to picture coding equipment which increases the quality of an image of at least a portion of a picture. The equipment described by *Watanabe* performs compression processing by considering the repeatability of an edge portion of the continuity of the pixel value change. (See paragraph 0025). Specifically, *Watanabe* includes an extraction means that extracts a particular part of a screen and processing means which processes the

particular part of the screen for making the coding error smaller. The picture coding equipment encodes information required to express a pixel value change on the screen on a curved surface to generate the curved surface. (See paragraph 0026). In one example, an edge detection circuit 102 calculates the edge position within each block and the degree of steepness of the edge. In another example, *Watanabe* describes that an edge of an image can be determined by comparing a pixel value to a predetermined threshold limit value. If the pixel value exceeds the threshold limit value, then the detection circuit 102 determines this to be an edge of the image. (See paragraph 0040). *Watanabe* also describes employing a weighting factor, W_i , to each pixel for carrying out weighting to detect an edge. (See paragraph 0041).

Contrary to the claimed invention, however, *Watanabe* does not disclose, teach or suggest "detection means for detecting a boundary line in the proximity of a plurality of pixels by comparing differences between pixel values associated with at least two of the pixels." Instead, *Watanabe* describes detecting an edge by comparing a pixel value to a predetermined threshold limit value. Additionally, *Watanabe* does not disclose, teach or suggest outputting the pixels or the weighted pixel values associated with each of the pixels.

For at least these reasons, *Watanabe* does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claim 6. Therefore, claim 6 and claim 9, which depends from claim 6, are each patentably distinguished over *Watanabe* and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7 and 8 include certain similar elements to amended claim 6. Additionally, amended claims 7 and 8 include weighting the pixel values associated with the pixels based on the distance between the pixels and the calculated positions of the boundary line where the weighting of the pixel values includes blending at least two of the pixel values of the pixels. *Watanabe* does not disclose, teach or suggest this element.


Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided above, claims 7 and 8 and claims 10 and 11, which depend from claims 7 and 8, respectively, are each patentably distinguished over *Watanabe* and are in condition for allowance.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-11 are novel and non-obvious over the art of record because *Watanabe* does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claims 6-11 be deemed allowable at this time and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

No fees are due. If any other fees are due in connection with this application, the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. (112857-224) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Christopher S. Hermanson

Reg. No. 48,244

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4225

Dated: April 19, 2005